

HIGH COURT OF UTTARANCHAL AT NAINITAL

Writ Petition No. 2990 of 2001 (SS)
(Old No. 8861/1997 (A))

Narain Dutt Padey son of Sri P.N. Pandey Machine Man
University Press, Govind Ballabh Pant University of Agriculture
and Technology, Pantnagar, District Udham Singh Nagar
.....Petitioner

Versus

1. Government of Uttar Pradesh
2. Govind Ballabh, Pant University of agriculture and
Technology, Pat Nagar, District Udham Singh Nagar.
..... Respondents

Dated: 24.8.2006

Sri Rakesh Thapliyal, Advocate for the petitioner
Sri Rajendra Dobhal Counsel for the respondents.

Hon'ble Rajesh Tandon, J.

Heard Sri Rakesh Thapliyal, counsel for the petitioner and
Standing Counsel for the respondents.

By the present writ petition the petitioner has prayed for a
writ of mandamus directing the respondents to fix the pay scale
of the petitioner of 1200-2040 as in case of Machinemen of the
persons employed in U.P. Govt. Press which has also been
recommended by 1989 report of "Samata-Samiti."

Briefly stated the petitioner was appointed on the post of
"Machine-man in the Press of respondent no.2 in the pay scale
of 100-180. he was confirmed on 31.3.1987 on the said post. In
the year 1973 the petitioner was paid the revised pay scale of

200-300 which was again revised to 354-550. The petitioner has submitted that as per report of "Samta Samiti" the pay scale for the post of the petitioner was recommended 1200-1800 but the petitioner is actually being paid the pay scale of 950-1500.

According to the petitioner since the report of Samta-Samiti was not correctly implemented in the case of the petitioner, the petitioner as well as other employees in the University Press made representations to the respondent no.2 on 9.3.1990 and 14.12.1990. Thereafter the Vice-Chancellor on 19.1.1991 sent a representation on 14.12.1990 to the respondent no.1. Again the petitioner and other employees of the University Press made a representation on 8.11.1994 to the Chancellor but no action has been taken on the representation of the petitioner and others.

The petitioner has alleged that the respondents have not decided the representations of the petitioner and others and by ignoring the recommendations of the Samta-Samiti.

In view of above, liberty is given to the petitioner to make a fresh representation to the respondents within a month after the receipt of the certified copy of this order. The respondents are directed to decide the representation of the petitioner within three months thereafter.

Subject to the observation made above, writ petition is disposed of.

No order as to costs.

Dated: 24.8.2006

Rajesh Tandon, J.

*Dhyani